UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,063	03/25/2004	Wolfgang Pfeifer	13913-170US1/2001P00030WO	8061

32864 7590 08/08/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
PRICE, NATHAN E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2194	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
08/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/811,063	PFEIFER, WOLFGANG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Price	2194	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 May 2007 and 25 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *05/07/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communications received 07 May 2007 and 25 May 2007. Claims 1 – 8 are pending. Previous objections and rejections not included in this Office Action have been withdrawn.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 25 May 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brasher et al. (US 6,895,586 B1; hereinafter Brasher).

5. As to claim 1, Brasher teaches a computer system for identifying a target component in an apparatus that has components related in a hierarchy [col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 11], the computer system comprising:

a first computer operable to execute a first application in which objects represent corresponding components, wherein the first application relates the objects in both a hierarchy identifying types of components and a different hierarchy identifying information associated with objects [col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 11; col. 11 lines 20 – 57; col. 12 lines 1 – 5; col. 16 lines 26 – 33];

a second computer coupled to the first computer via a network [Fig. 3; col. 3 lines 46 – 48];

wherein the first computer includes a message generator operable to receive information relating to both the type hierarchy and the object hierarchy from the application and to provide a message with a type chain in a parent-child direction and an object chain also in the parent-child direction, wherein the type chain includes a type node associated with a target object and the object chain

includes an object node associated with the target object, a combination of the type node and the object node identify the target object that corresponds to the target component, and a combination of ascendants of the type node and ascendants of the object node correspond to parent components [col. 4 lines 1 – 11; col. 13 lines 50 – 65; col. 15 line 60 – col. 16 line 33]; and

wherein the second computer has a message interpreter operable to parse both chains to provide identification of the target component with type and object as well as identification of the parent components with types and objects [col. 12 lines 5 – 12; col. 13 lines 50 – 65; col. 15 lines 31 – 47, 60 – col. 16 line 33].

6. As to claims 4, 6 and 7, see the rejection of claim 1.

7. As to claim 3, Brasher teaches the message generator at the first computer is operable to append an identifier type to the type chain, and to append an identifier object to the object chain [col. 15 lines 24 – 30; col. 16 lines 27 – 67].

8. As to claim 8, Brasher teaches the first and second runtime environments use different object models [col. 12 lines 1 – 5].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brasher as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Borgendale et al. (US Pat. 4,731,735; hereinafter Borgendale).

10. Brasher teaches type-object hierarchy information and types, but fails to specifically teach presenting data in different languages. However, Borgendale teaches that the first computer presents information to a first user and thereby adds statements in a first language, and that the second computer presents information in a second language [abstract; col. 4 lines 29 – 54]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because Brasher recognizes that a namespace can be distributed across different countries [col. 2 lines 12 – 20], motivating one of ordinary skill in the art to consider the teachings of Borgendale to handle language differences that could be encountered when dealing with multiple countries.

11. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brasher as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Tanenbaum (Tanenbaum, Andrew S. "Computer Networks." Third Edition, Prentice Hall PTR, 1996; pages 630-643.).

12. As to claim 5, Brasher at least implies displaying the identification of the target component with type statements, wherein the type statements are provided locally [col. 15 line 60 – col. 16 lines 2, 27 – 33]. Furthermore, Tanenbaum teaches that SNMP includes a description parameter for object types intended for human users [page 640 ¶ 3]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because Brasher teaches use of SNMP [col. 13 lines 27 – 30] and the cited portion of Tanenbaum teaches details of SNMP.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record on the P.T.O. 892 that has not been relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Careful consideration of the cited art is required prior to responding to this Office Action, see 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Price whose telephone number is (571) 272-4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am - 3:00pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER